



STATE OF CALIFORNIA

GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

FILED
03/30/21
09:37 AM

March 30, 2021

Agenda ID #19359
Ratesetting

TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN RULEMAKING 15-03-010:

This is the proposed decision of Administrative Law Judge Fogel. Until and unless the Commission hears the item and votes to approve it, the proposed decision has no legal effect. This item may be heard, at the earliest, at the Commission's May 6, 2021 Business Meeting. To confirm when the item will be heard, please see the Business Meeting agenda, which is posted on the Commission's website 10 days before each Business Meeting.

Parties to the proceeding may file comments on the proposed decision as provided in Rule 14.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Comments must be filed, pursuant to Rule 1.13, either electronically or in hard copy. Comments should be served on parties to this proceeding in accordance with Rules 1.9 and 1.10. Electronic and hard copies of comments should be sent to ALJ Fogel at Cathleen.fogel@cpuc.ca.gov and to the Intervenor Compensation Program at Icompcoordinator@cpuc.ca.gov. The current service list for this proceeding is available on the Commission's website at www.cpuc.ca.gov.

/s/ ANNE E. SIMON

Anne E. Simon

Chief, Administrative Law Judge

AES:mph

Attachment

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ FOGEL** (Mailed 3/30/2021)**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Identify Disadvantaged Communities in the San Joaquin Valley and Analyze Economically Feasible Options to Increase Access to Affordable Energy in those Disadvantaged Communities.

Rulemaking 15-03-010

**DECISION APPROVING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION FOR
SELF HELP ENTERPRISES****Summary**

This decision approves \$181,491.25 in intervenor compensation (plus interest) for Self Help Enterprises, a 26.0 percent reduction of the \$245,403.75 claimed.

1. Background

On March 26, 2015, the Commission opened R.15-03-010 to identify disadvantaged communities (DACs) in the San Joaquin Valley (SJV) and analyze economically feasible options to increase access to affordable energy in those communities. The Commission thus far has approved three decisions in this open proceeding. As part of Phase I of the proceeding, on May 11, 2017, the Commission adopted Decision (D.) 17-05-014, which identified 170 communities as eligible DACs under the definition provided in Public Utilities Code Section 783.5.2. Phase II of the proceeding was broken down into Track A and Track B.

On August 23, 2018, the Commission adopted D.18-08-019, which approved funding for a data gathering plan, as well as identifying nine more eligible SJV DACs, resolving Track B of Phase II. On December 13, 2018, the Commission adopted D.18-12-015, the Decision Approving San Joaquin Valley Disadvantaged Communities Pilot Projects. D.18-12-015 mostly resolved Track A of Phase II.

Self Help Enterprises (SHE), an intervenor in this proceeding, filed two claims for intervenor compensation, one on October 24, 2018 and a second on February 19, 2019, for work associated with D.18-08-019 and D.18-12-015. Since the later claim includes all line items contained in the first claim, we are consolidating both requests into one. In total, SHE requests \$245,403.75 in funding, broken down into the following seven categories:

- A. Consideration and determination of community preference and coordination with community-based organizations to inform the Commission;
- B. Pilot Community outreach and engagement efforts to increase participation;
- C. Evaluation and feedback on pilot proposals;
- D. Pilot community costs and benefits issues;
- E. Support for the development and evaluation of pilot project options for Monterey Park Tract;
- F. Pilot project administration, implementation, coordination and general participation issues; and
- G. Intervenor Compensation.

On March 25, 2019, the California Public Utilities Commission's Public Advocates Office (Cal Advocates) filed a response to the February 19, 2019 compensation claims filed by SHE, the Leadership Counsel on Justice and Accountability (LCJA), and the Center on Race, Poverty and the Environment

(CRPE). SHE, LCJA, and CRPE filed comments and other documents collectively as “the Pilot Team” in this proceeding.

This decision resolves the claim filed by SHE. As described in greater detail below, funding for all hours disallowed will be subtracted from the total request of \$245,403.75. To explain our determination, we chose a more expanded discussion of the issues raised via a more traditional decision format, rather than the simplified standardized form normally used by the Commission for its intervenor compensation decisions.

2. Eligible Intervenors

The Intervenor Compensation Program, enacted in Public Utilities Code Sections 1801-1812, requires California jurisdictional utilities to pay the reasonable costs of an intervenor’s participation if the intervenor makes a substantial contribution to the Commission’s final decision. Section 1807 provides that the utility may adjust its rates to collect the amount awarded from its ratepayers.

All of the following procedures and criteria must be satisfied for an intervenor to obtain a compensation award:

- 1) The intervenor must satisfy certain procedural requirements, including the filing of a sufficient Notice of Intent to claim intervenor compensation within 30 days of the prehearing conference.
- 2) The intervenor must be a customer or a participant representing consumers, customers, or subscribers of a utility subject to our jurisdiction (Section 1802(b)).
- 3) The intervenor must file and serve a request for compensation award within 60 days of our final order or decision. (Section 1804(c).)
- 4) The intervenor must demonstrate significant financial hardship. (Sections 1802(h); 1804(b)(1).)

- 5) The intervenor's presentation must have made a "substantial contribution" to the proceeding, through the adoption, in whole or in part, of the intervenor's contention or recommendations by a Commission order or decision. (Sections 1802(j), 1803(a).)
- 6) The claimed fees and costs are reasonable (Section 1801), necessary for and related to the substantial contribution (Section 1801.3(f)), comparable to the market rates (Section 1806) and productive (Section 1801.3(b), (f)).

3. Response of Public Advocates Office

In its response, Cal Advocates asserts that the Pilot Team organizations, including SHE, do not appear eligible for intervenor compensation because the organizations collectively advocated for compensated roles as part of this proceeding. Cal Advocates points to decisions where the Commission interpreted customer status under Section 1802(b) to mean that intervenors that advocate for their own financial interests are not eligible for compensation, regardless of whether ratepayers may also benefit.¹

In approving D.18-08-019, the Commission authorized a broad data gathering plan to collect information about demographics, energy usage, energy costs, housing conditions, environmental quality, and other issues facing residents in disadvantaged communities in the San Joaquin Valley. Cal Advocates notes that, as part of the Pilot Team, SHE advocated that the Commission designate SHE as a co-chair of the Data Plan Working Group created by D.18-08-019 and award SHE funding as part of the budget approved for the Data Gathering Plan.²

¹ *Response of the Public Advocates Office to Intervenor Requests for Compensation*, R. 15-03-010, March 15, 2019 at 6.

² *Id* at 7-8.

An Assigned Commissioner Ruling (ACR), issued on October 3, 2018, proposed that each community participating in a pilot project have “Community Energy Navigators” (CENs).³ The CENs, according to the ACR, would be community members who would “help educate community members about existing energy program options” about the pilot projects. As noted in the ACR, this proposal was based on a recommendation advanced by PG&E.⁴

Public Advocates asserts that the Pilot Team advocated that the Commission should grant it (including SHE, LCJA, and CRPE) a key role in the implementation of pilot projects. Specifically, in opening comments on the ACR, the Pilot Team supported allocating funding for CENs.⁵ In reply comments, the Pilot Team advocated that the Commission should designate it as a paid “Project Facilitator” for all pilots and provide funding for this role. The Pilot Team also advocated that the Commission combine the Project Facilitator role with the CEN concept and provide a budget of as much as \$100,000 per community for these combined roles.⁶

Cal Advocates also raised several specific line items in SHE’s compensation claim as not being documented accurately (e.g., hours for an ex parte meeting in the claim are more than the hours in the ex parte notice).

³ *Assigned Commissioner’s Ruling Proposing Phase II Pilot Projects in Twelve Communities in the San Joaquin Valley and Noticing All-Party Meeting*, October 3, 2018, at. 44.

⁴ *Ibid.* Cal Advocate’s Response at 9 erroneously states that the CENs concept was based on a proposal by SHE and LCJA.

⁵ *Id* at 9.

⁶ *Id* at 10.

4. Discussion and Analysis

We award SHE compensation, but not for the entire claim. In reaching this decision, we attempt to balance the following three principles of the Commission's Intervenor Compensation Program:

- The statutory mandate to compensate organizations that represent residential customers in proceedings before the Commission and contribute in a meaningful way;
- The Commission's goal of encouraging the participation of constituencies that have not participated previously in Commission proceedings, and
- The expectations the Commission has outlined for intervenors filing compensation claims, including:
 - An intervenor funded by ratepayers should pursue single-mindedly the interest of the utility customers that it purportedly represents;⁷ and
 - An intervenor's advocacy should not place it in the position of being more of a contractor or consultant than a customer.⁸

We applied the above principles to the following facts:

- SHE satisfied all the procedural requirements necessary to make its request for compensation in this proceeding (*e.g.*, filing a Notice of Intent and claim in a timely manner);
- SHE made a substantive contribution to the proceeding, including identifying the specific communities that would benefit from the pilots, what those pilot projects would

⁷ See D.00-04-026 at 12. The Commission denied three intervenor compensation claims from Utility Design, Inc. (UDI), determining that UDI was acting more like a PG&E competitor, instead of representing PG&E residential customers.

⁸ See D.07-06-023 at 8. "The record since developed in this proceeding and other Commission decisions indicates, however, that [SF Power Small Customer Aggregation Pilot Program] SCAPP is now an existing program that SFCP implements under contract to PG&E. D.06-11-049 authorized PG&E to pay [San Francisco Community Power] SFCP an additional \$650,000 for program implementation. SFCP benefited materially and directly from this portion of D.06-11-049. SFCP here acted in its own self-interest when it advocated for additional contract funding."

entail and cost, and made considerable outreach to disadvantaged communities in the San Joaquin Valley, ensuring their participation;

- The Pilot Team, of which SHE was a member, advocated that SHE be given compensated roles implementing the orders in this proceeding; and
- SHE has been awarded two contracts, one as part of the data gathering plan (\$297,800)⁹ and the other as part of the Community Energy Navigator Program (\$1.5 million).¹⁰

Finally, we consider the context in which these comments were submitted, including the workload this proceeding created for parties involved in it. In a normal proceeding, an intervenor may be asked to provide testimony, evidentiary exhibits and comments. This proceeding was much broader in scope, including numerous comment cycles and other filings in response to several ACRs, proposals submitted by the utilities, and proposed decisions, preparing prehearing or preworkshop statements and caseload management statements, along with participation in several workshops and public participation hearings.

At the center of the concerns raised by Cal Advocates are three filings of several produced by SHE and/or the Pilot Team:

- *Pilot Team Opening Comments on Proposed Decision Adopting Data Gathering Plan in San Joaquin Valley, August 13, 2018;*

⁹ In D.18-08-019, the Commission directed PG&E to include funding in its budget for the data gathering plan for SHE's role performing community outreach related to the data gathering effort. PG&E submitted Advice Letter 4031-G/5409-E, which the Commission approved in Resolution G-3550, and allocated \$297,800 to SHE for involvement in the data gathering effort.

¹⁰ On September 16, 2019, the Commission's Energy Division notified the proceeding's Service List that it awarded the contract for the San Joaquin Valley Disadvantaged Communities - Community Energy Navigator Program Manager to Self Help Enterprises. D.18-12-015 authorized a \$1.5 million contract.

- *Pilot Team Opening Comments on Assigned Commissioner's Ruling Proposing Phase II Pilot Projects in Twelve Communities in the San Joaquin Valley, October 22, 2018; and*
- *Pilot Team Reply Comments on Assigned Commissioner's Ruling Proposing Phase II Pilot Projects in Twelve Communities in the San Joaquin Valley, October 25, 2018.*

In the August 2018 comments, the Pilot Team asserted that “[s]hould the Commission agree to add SHE as a co-chair of the Working Group, it is reasonable for the currently proposed \$3 million budget for data collection to in part compensate SHE for such continued efforts.”¹¹

In the October 2018 opening comments, the Pilot Team advocated for additional funding for the CEN Program¹² and expressed its interest in continued work in the community on these issues.¹³

In the October 2018 reply comments, the Pilot Team advocated for a compensated role as part of the proceeding and advocated itself as the entity best suited for outreach in the pilot communities, such as the following statements:

[T]he Pilot Team requests that the Commission designate and authorize funding for the Pilot Team to play two important roles during this phase: “Project Facilitator” and “Pilot Project Oversight Working Group Member.

...The Project Facilitator will also assist families with determining their household's choices where

¹¹ *Pilot Team Opening Comments on Proposed Decision Adopting Data Gathering Plan in San Joaquin Valley, August 13, 2018 at 7.*

¹² *Id* at 13. “The Pilot Team strongly supports this idea. We note, however, that this investment of \$100,000 be *in addition* to the per community budget identified in the ACR to ensure effective implementation of both the pilot projects and the CEN. In several communities, a \$100,000 cut out from the budget would have significant impacts and threaten the viability of the pilot to reach eligible customers.”

¹³ *Id* at 17. “We recommend that the community may request a Pilot Team member work in conjunction with the identified administrator to administer the program in each community.”

applicable, provide on-going education, answer residents' questions, and assist with conflict resolution. This overlaps with the roles of the Community Energy Navigator ("CEN"). The Pilot Team therefore requests that the Commission combine these two roles for the Pilot Team members to lead. We acknowledge GRID's request to be the CEN in the communities in which they are authorized as the administrator; however, the Pilot Team is better situated in terms of relationships with communities, language and cultural competence to lead this role and can certainly integrate GRID's, and other administrators' technical expertise. In addition, different types of projects require different CEN tasks, and budgets may vary per community. The earmark of \$100,000 may well be sufficient to account for fluctuating budgets, but the Commission should account for these differences that could require increased funding.¹⁴

The advocacy efforts contained in these specific filings raise doubts over whether SHE single-mindedly pursued the interest of utility customers. If these statements were the Pilot Team's primary focus, or if these filings were the majority of the intervenor's filings in this proceeding, instead of three of many filings, the Commission likely would deny the entire claim, finding that because SHE advocated for funding as part of the proceeding (and received it), SHE is not eligible for intervenor compensation because it was representing the organization's interests, not residential customers.

However, when reviewing the many other filings prepared by SHE and the Pilot Team, none of which advocate for compensated roles, nor can be seen as overtly attempting to influence the proceeding in a manner to ensure it would

¹⁴ *Pilot Team Reply Comments on Assigned Commissioner's Ruling Proposing Phase II Pilot Projects in Twelve Communities in the San Joaquin Valley*, October 25, 2018 at 3.

receive a contract, we are left with a different impression, one in which SHE and the Pilot Team made a substantial contribution to this proceeding, successfully involving communities that normally do not interact with the Commission. That work merits at least some intervenor compensation.

A second issue to examine is the CEN Program contract awarded to SHE. The Commission has denied intervenor compensation to entities that receive funding from utilities through grants, contracts and other sources.¹⁵ However, we note that this contract was awarded to SHE well after it filed its claim. Thus, other than the advocacy to receive this contract, an obvious conflict of interest is not apparent, though the Commission could find one in future intervenor compensation claims.

To achieve the balance discussed at the beginning of this section, we award SHE a significant portion of its claim, but reduce the amount of funding in some of the categories listed in the background section to reflect disallowing the work that raises questions over SHE's representation of itself or residential customers. In some instances, the disallowance is cut and dry, while in other instances we make a general judgment. Given that SHE clearly advocated for a compensated role as part of the data gathering plan and that most of that work appears to be contained in Section F (Pilot project administration, implementation, coordination and general participation issues), we disallow the work in that section, roughly eleven percent of the total claim.

¹⁵ For example, see D. 18-11-10, in which the Commission denied intervenor compensation to the Clean Coalition. A significant reason for the denial included that Clean Coalition's typical projects during the four years prior to its claim included work either funded through grants or compensated by renewable energy market participants, including PG&E, SCE and SDG&E, among others.

Additionally, we note that the documents in question appear in significant portions of Section B (Pilot Community outreach and engagement efforts to increase participation). The work in this section totals roughly one-third of SHE's compensation claim. We find it would be inappropriate to disallow the entire section, which includes a significant amount of work in other areas. Thus, here we choose to disallow the hours charged to this section in September and October of 2018, roughly when the filings in question were prepared. Finally, as described more in Appendix A, we disallow or discount other hours identified by Cal Advocates for events not in the record, or meetings that were shorter in ex parte notices than in the claim, among other items. We also adjusted the hourly rate for one staff member to reflect better their experience working before the Commission. With the adjustments, discounts and disallowances, SHE will be compensated \$181,491.25, a 26.0 percent reduction of the \$245,403.75 it claimed.

5. Comments on Proposed Decision

The proposed decision of the ALJ in this matter was mailed to the parties in accordance with Section 311 of the Public Utilities Code and comments were allowed under Rule 14.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Comments were filed on _____, and reply comments were filed on _____ by _____.

6. Assignment of Proceeding

Martha Guzman Aceves is the assigned Commissioner and Cathleen A. Fogel is the assigned Administrative Law Judge in this proceeding.

Findings of Fact

1. SHE has made a substantial contribution to D.18-08-009 and D.18-12-015.
2. SHE, through its part in the Pilot Team, advocated for compensation as part of this proceeding.

3. The requested hourly rates for SHEs' representatives, as adjusted herein, are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.

4. The claimed costs and expenses, as adjusted herein, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.

5. The total of amount reasonable compensation is \$181,491.25.

Conclusions of Law

1. The Claim, with any adjustment set forth above, satisfies all requirements of Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Self Help Enterprises shall be awarded \$181,491.25.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and Southern California Gas Company shall pay the Self Help Enterprises their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional electric and gas revenues for the 2018 calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. If such data is unavailable, the most recent electric and gas revenue data shall be used. Payment of the award shall include compound interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month non-financial commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning on May 5, 2019, the 75th day after the filing of the Self Help Enterprises' request, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. The comment period for today's decision is not waived.

This order is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A**Specific Claim:**

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Paul Boyer CD Program Director	2017	54.5	\$250	See attached resume in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1806.	\$13,625.00	54.5	\$250	\$13,625.00
Paul Boyer CD Program Director	2018	73.5	\$255	See attached resume in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1806.	\$18,742.50	54 [1]	\$255	\$13,770.00
Abigail Solis, CD Specialist	2017	174	\$200	See attached resume in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1806.	\$34,800.00	127.5 [1], [3]	\$175 [4]	\$22,312.50
Abigail Solis, CD Specialist	2018	765.5	\$205	See attached resume in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1806.	\$156,927.50	583.2 5 [1], [2], [3]	\$180 [4]	\$104,985.00

Armando Murrieta, CD Specialist	2018	12	\$110	See attached resume in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1806.	\$1,320.00	12	\$110	\$1,320.00
Carlos Nunez, CD Specialist	2017	13	\$100	See attached resume in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1806.	\$1,300.00	13	\$100	\$1,300.00
Carlos Nunez, CD Specialist	2018	20.5	\$105	See attached resume in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1806.	\$2,152.50	20.5	\$105	\$2,152.50
Christine Gutierrez, CD Specialist	2018	8	\$100	See attached resume in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1806.	\$800.00	0 [2]	\$0	\$0.00
Eddie Ocampo. CD Manager	2017	9.5	\$130	See attached resume in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1806.	\$1,235.00	9.5	\$130	\$1,235.00
Eddie Ocampo.	2018	15	\$135	See attached resume in	\$2,025.00	15	\$135	\$2,025.00

CD Manager				accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1806.				
Efrain Casas, CD Specialist	2017	2	\$100	See attached resume in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1806.	\$200.00	2	\$100	\$200.00
Efrain Casas, CD Specialist	2018	8.5	\$105	See attached resume in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1806.	\$892.50	4 [2]	\$105	\$420.00
Eva Dominguez CD Specialist	2018	9	\$110	See attached resume in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1806.	\$990.00	9	\$110	\$990.00
Helena Gutierrez, CD Specialist	2018	8	\$105	See attached resume in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1806.	\$840.00	0 [2]	\$0	\$0.00
Jessi Snyder, CD Manager	2018	7.5	\$150	See attached resume in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util.	\$1,125.00	7.5	\$150	\$1,125.00

				Code §1806.				
Juan Cano, CD Specialist	2017	1	\$110	See attached resume in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1806.	\$110.00	1	\$110	\$110.00
Juan Cano, CD Specialist	2018	2	\$115	See attached resume in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1806.	\$230.00	0 [2]	\$0	\$0.00
Maria Salazar, CD Specialist	2018	26	\$100	See attached resume in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1806.	\$2,600.00	23 [2]	\$100	\$2,300.00
Mariela Vizcarra, Project Tech	2018	10	\$80	See attached resume in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1806.	\$800.00	0 [2]	\$0	\$0.00
Seamus Guerin, CD Specialist	2018	11.5	\$105	See attached resume in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1806.	\$1,207.50	7.5 [2]	\$105	\$787.50

Subtotal: \$ _____						Subtotal: \$168,657.50		
OTHER FEES								
Describe here what OTHER HOURLY FEES you are Claiming (paralegal, travel **, etc.):								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate\$	Total \$
Paul Boyer CD Program Director	2017	4	\$125	See attached resume in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1806. Rate is 50% travel.	\$500.00	4	\$125	\$500.00
Paul Boyer CD Program Director	2018	5	\$127.50	See attached resume in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1806. Rate is 50% travel.	\$637.50	5	\$127.50	\$637.50
Abigail Solis, CD Specialist	2017	8	\$100	See attached resume in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1806. Rate is 50% travel	\$800.00	4 [3]	\$87.50 [4]	\$350.00
Abigail Solis, CD Specialist	2018	80.5	\$102.50	See attached resume in accordance with Cal.	\$8,251.25	80.5	\$90 [4]	\$7,245.00

				Pub. Util. Code §1806. Rate is 50% travel				
Armando Murrieta, CD Specialist	2018	8	\$55	See attached resume in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1806. Rate is 50% travel	\$440.00	8	\$55	\$440.00
Helena Gutierrez, CD Specialist	2018	4	\$52.50	See attached resume in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1806. Rate is 50% travel	\$210.00	4	\$52.50	\$210.00
Mariela Vizcarra, Project Tech	2018	4	\$40	See attached resume in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1806. Rate is 50% travel	\$160.00	4	\$40	\$160.00
Subtotal: \$						Subtotal: \$9,542.50		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Paul Boyer CD	2019	4	\$127.50	See attached resume in	\$510.00	4	\$127.50	\$510.00

Program Director				accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1806. Rate is 50% for claim preparation.				
Abigail Solis, CD Specialist	2019	19	\$102.50	See attached resume in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1806. Rate is 50% for claim preparation.	\$1,947.50	19	\$92.50 [4]	\$1,757.50
Jeffrey Pontius, Admin Analyst	2019	19.5	\$52.50	See attached resume in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1806. Rate is 50% for claim preparation.	\$1,023.75	19.5	\$52.50	\$1,023.75
Subtotal: \$						Subtotal: \$3,291.25		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$						TOTAL AWARD: \$181,491.25		
<p>*We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit the records and books of the intervenors to the extent necessary to verify the basis for the award (§1804(d)). Intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Intervenor’s records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs</p>								

for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.

****Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time are typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate**

CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments

Item	Reason
[1] Hours disallowed for Issue F	<p>As discussed in Section 4 of this decision, all hours working on Issue F were disallowed, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 19.5 hours for Paul Boyer in 2018 • 40.5 hours for Abigail Solis in 2017 • 88.5 hours for Abigail Solis in 2018
[2] Hours disallowed for Issue B	<p>As discussed in Section 4 of this decision, all hours working on Issue B in September and October 2018 were disallowed, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 66 hours for Abigail Solis • 8 hours for Christine Gutierrez • 4.5 hours for Efrain Casas • 8 hours for Helena Gutierrez • 2 hours for Juan Cano • 3 hours for Maria Salazar • 10 hours for Mariela Vizcarra • 4 hours for Seamus Guerin
[3] Hours disallowed for not being in the record	<p>Disallowed hours for meetings not in the record, or in the record, but with less hours. Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • November 14, 2017 ex parte meeting where no notice was filed • March 18, 2018 excessive hours claimed for ex parte meeting. SHE's timesheets claim 4 hours for the ex parte meeting while the ex parte notice filed in the proceeding shows a 1-hour meeting. • May 9, 2018 excessive hours claimed for ex parte meeting. SHE's timesheets claim 4 hours for an ex parte meeting while the ex parte notice filed in the proceeding shows a 30-minute meeting. • May 23, 2018 excessive hours for tour and community meeting in California City, CA that do not align with the timeframe of the tour start time and conclusion of the community meeting • June 29, 2018 SHE's timesheet claims 5 hours for a Solar PV Consumer Protections Workshop that was not part of R.15-03-010 • July 23, 2018 excessive hours claimed for ex parte meeting. SHE's timesheets claim 1 hour for an ex parte meeting while the ex parte notice filed in the proceeding shows a 30-minute meeting.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • November 15, 2018 excessive hours claimed for ex parte meetings. SHE's timesheets claim 4 hours for meetings with Commissioners Peterman, Picker, and Rechtchaffen while the ex parte notices filed in the proceeding show a 30-minute meeting with an advisor to Commissioner Picker, a 30-minute meeting with an advisor to Commissioner Peterman, and a 40-minute meeting with an advisor to Commissioner Rechtschaffen. • November 16, 2018 excessive hours claimed for ex parte meeting. SHE's timesheets claim 8 hours for meetings with Commissioner Guzman-Aceves while the ex parte notice filed in the proceeding shows a 30-minute meeting. • December 13, 2018 excessive hours claimed for attending and supporting residents' participation at a Commission voting meeting as the hours claimed exceed the length of the Commission voting meeting <p>In total, 10 hours (6 hours for the ex parte meeting where no notice was filed and 4 corresponding travel hours) were disallowed from Abigail Solis in 2017 and 27.75 hours in 2018.</p>
[4] Reduced Hourly Rate	<p>In 2017, Ms. Solis became the Senior Community Development Specialist for SHE. Ms. Solis is responsible for leading the development and implementation of energy projects that assist rural communities and serves as the co-chair to CPUC SJV DAC Data Gathering Work Group and Public Affairs representative for the organization to the CPUC, Energy Commission, Investor-Owned Utilities, and funders at workshops, hearings, and meetings. After reviewing Solis' resume, we find a rate of \$175 to be more reasonable and reflective of Solis' experience level for work she completed in 2017. The rate of \$175 an hour is reflective of Solis' 0-2 years of regulatory experience and aligns with the rate ranges set by Resolution ALJ-345.</p>

(END OF APPENDIX A)